NOXIOUS WEED ASSESSMENT

GREATER YELLOWSTONE AREA

R.L. Haag
US Forest Service, Northern Region
and
Stu Coleman
Yellowstone National Park

April 11, 1989

FEB 12 2014

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary : Abstract

II. Matrix Display of Forests Responses

III. Questionnaire

IV. Strengths and Weaknesses of Forest Programs

V. Observations

VI. Presentation

Executive Summary

This endeavor is to assess the current efforts being used to manage noxious weeds in the GYA. A questionnaire was completed by all National Forests in the GYA.

The results indicate existence of approved NEPA documents, inventories and I.P.M. efforts on most Forests, as well as a weed free hay policy associated with wilderness areas. There is some need for improvement in consistency and development. These include such items as I.P.M., inventory, coordination with neighbors and program development. Also a coordinated monitoring strategy is needed for all Forests.

GREATER YELLOWSTONE AREA – NOXIOUS WEED ASSESSMENT

	Inventory	Current Program Success / Results	Is Plan / Strategy Published	Does Plan / Strategy Coordinate & Involve Neighbors	Current Plan / Strategy Control : Elimination	I.P.M.	Approved NEPA Documented?	Level of NEPA Approval	New Infestation Strategy : Burns, 1988	Existance of Monitoring Program	Require Weed Free Certified Hay in Wilderness	Funding Needs	Adequate Dollars Existing Program	Current Funding	Additional Dollars Needed Due to Fires 1988
Custer N.F. (R–1)	Y	Y	Y	Y	C	Y	Y	Forest District	N *	Y	Y		$168M	$139M	$0 *
Gallatin N.F. (R–1)	Y	Y	Y	Y	C/E	Y	Y	Forest District	Y	Y	N No Hay Allowed		$50M	$38M	1ST $5M 2&3RD YR $8M
Beaverhead N.F. (R–1)	Y	Y	Y	Y	C/E	Y	Y	Forest District	Y	Y	Y		$122M	$100.6M	1ST $1.2M 2&3RD YR $2.7M
Targhee N.F. (R–4)	Y	N	Y	Y	Prevent C/E	Y	Y	Regional Forest District	Y	Y	N No Hay Allowed		$140M	$26M	1ST $3M 2&3RD YR $7.5M
Bridger–Teton N.F. (R–4)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Prevent C/E	Y	Y	Regional Forest	Y	Y	Y Teton County		$100M	$40M	1ST $5M 2&3RD YR $10M
Shoshone N.F. (R–2)	N	Y	N	N	C/E	N	Y	Forest	Y	Y	Y		$20M	$12.2M	1ST $5.6M 2&3RD YR $5.6M
Yellowstone N.P.	Y	Y	Y	N	C/E	N	N	N/A	N	N	N No Hay Allowed		?	$0	1ST $30M 2&3RD YR $60M

* Not affected by 1988 fires

NOXIOUS WEED QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE: To provide current information on noxious weed management efforts for the National Forest in the Greater Yellowstone Area.

OBJECTIVE: To assess the current situation and highlight strengths and/or weaknesses.

QUESTIONS:

1. Do you have an inventory of infested acres by species? If so, list by species the number of acres infested on NFS land.

2. For each species identified in question one, show the percentage (by acre) that has been: (1) eliminated and (2) controlled.

3. Do you have a published noxious weed management plan or strategy?

4. Does your management plan include a strategy for coordination with your neighbors? Were they involved in its development?

5. If you have a management plan or strategy, show your strategy for the species identified in number one above, as follows: (1) control or (2) elimination.

6. For each species in question one, show the type of integrated management activity proposed, i.e., chemical, mechanical, biological, manual, etc.

7. Do you have an approved NEPA document for your noxious weed program?

8. If you have an approved NEPA document, is it site specific by project, or programatic for the forest, region or district? Show the level of approval and date approved.

9. Do you have a strategy for a followup assessment of new infestations on acres burned during 1988? Briefly describe your strategy.

10. Do you have a monitoring program for keeping your noxious weed situation current? Briefly describe your monitoring program?

11. Do you require certified weed free hay in wilderness? Other areas?

12. Some general funding questions:

    a. What would be an adequate funding level for your existing program (excluding acres burned in 1988)?

b. What is your current funding level?

c. What additional funding is needed to manage anticipated infestations, as a result of the 1988 burns? Beginning with FY90, show dollars, by FY, through FY94.

GYA - NOXIOUS WEED ASSESSMENT
Strengths & Weaknesses

STRENGTHS:

- All Have Approved NEPA Documents (except NPS).
- All Have Some Level of Inventory.
- Most Using Integrated Pest Management Approach.
- All Recognize Importance of Using Weed Free Feed.

WEAKNESSES:

- NEPA Documentation in R2 and NPS Inadequate.
- Inventories and Trend Updates Are Not Universally Pursued.
- Integrated Pest Management is not Universally Pursued nor Applied.
- Consistency Lacking in Weed-Free Feed Policy.
- Current Funding For Programs In R-2, R-4, and NPS Inadequate.
- Coordination and Public Involvement in R-2 and NPS Weak.

GYA - NOXIOUS WEED ASSESSMENT
Observations

1. All recognize importance and threat to GYA.
2. Personal dedication about the issue is high.
3. Each unit at a different place due to dollar and manpower constraints.
4. Program needs elevated on the Shoshone National Forest and NPS (i.e. funding).
5. Integrated Pest Management needs to be pursued and incorporated in all current programs.
6. Initiate and/or strengthen cooperation and involvement with neighbors.
7. Need to develop a monitoring strategy.
8. Need a uniform approach to the use of weed seed free feed.
9. Need to assess NEPA process for consistency.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

	Inventory	Monitoring 0 100
Custer	Y	////////////////////
Gallatin	Y	////////////////////
Beaverhead	Y	////////////////////////
Targhee	Y	/////////
Bridger-Teton	Y	//////////////
Shoshone	N	/////
NPS	N	

MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

COORDINATION AND INVOLVEMENT OF NEIGHBORS

	Per: Regional Plan	Forest EIS	Coordinate Annually
CUSTER		X	X
GALLATIN		X	X
BEAVER-HEAD		X	X
TARGHEE	X	X	X
BRIDGER-TETON	X	X	X
SHOSHONE		X	NO
NPS		NO	NO

MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Integrated Pest Managment

	Degree of Pursuit 0 100
Custer	//////////////////////////
Gallatin	//////////////////////////
Beaverhead	//////////////////////////
Targhee	//////////////
Bridger-Teton	//////////////////////
Shoshone	///////
NPS	

MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

NEPA DOCUMENTATION

	Published Plan	Approved NEPA Document	Level of NEPA Approval
CUSTER	YES	Y	Forest/District
GALLATIN	Y	Y	Forest/District
BEAVER-HEAD	Y	Y	Forest/District
TARGHEE	Y	Y	Regional/Forest
BRIDGER-TETON	Y	Y	Regional/Forest
SHOSHONE	N	N	Forest
NPS	N*	N	N/A

*General Exotic Vegetation Plan

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

		Current Funding	Adequate Funding for Existing Program	Additional $'s Needed Due to Fires Per Year
*	TARGHEE	$ 26,000	$140,000	$ 3,000-->7,5000
*	BRIDGER-TETON	$ 40,000	$100,000	$ 5,000-->10,000
*	SHOSHONE	$ 12,200	$ 20,000	$ 5,600-->
~	NPS	0	$ 30,000 ?	$30,000-->60,000
+	CUSTER	$139,000	$168,000	0
+	GALLATIN	$ 38,000	$ 50,000	$5,000-->8,000
+	BEAVER-HEAD	$100,600	$122,000	$1,200-->3,200
	TOTAL	$355,800	$630,000	$49,000-->94300

*Current Program not adequate.
+Current program adequate.
~Current program is not funded.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

Possible Approaches

-- **CONTINUE AS IS**

-- **ELEVATE IMPORTANCE OF PROGRAM**

Increased Coordination

Higher Program Profile

-- **DEVELOP A GYA APPROACH**

Pull Together a Task Force

Develop Overall Management Strategy